

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended. Applicant reserves the right, however, to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications. In view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks below, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 1-5, 8, and 9-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2003/0233507 to Yu et al. (“Yu”) in view of Jones et al. (“Jones”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, among other things, “a single slot adapted to accommodate [a] plurality of types of cards” and that “data is exchanged with an opening part having connectors that can handle the plurality of types of cards.” These are important features of the claim 1 device, which is designed to accept and communicate with multiple card types using a single slot and opening with connectors. See, for example, Figures 1A-1C, illustrating the accommodation of multiple card types.

The Office Action, at page 4, states that Yu does not teach a single slot adapted to accommodate the plurality of types of cards. For similar reasons, Yu does not teach or suggest that “data is exchanged with an opening part having connectors that can handle the plurality of types of cards.” Yu describes an electronic card that has multiple interface ports (11, 14) that are physically separated from each other. See, e.g., Yu at Figure 1.

Jones does not cure the deficiencies of Yu with respect to these features. While Jones (at paragraph [0017]) does describe “a universal adapter for flash memory cards” it does not describe a single slot for a plurality of types of cards or that data is exchanged with an opening part having connectors for multiple cards.

Jones describes two embodiments. In the first embodiment a memory card reader comprises “a first slot to receive a first memory card of a first format” and “a second slot to receive

a second memory card of a second format.” Jones at [0018]. Since this embodiment uses a different slot for each card, it clearly does not teach or suggest the single slot or the opening part with connectors for multiple cards as described in claim 1.

In the second embodiment, Jones describes a memory card reader with “a single-slot configured to receive one of first memory card type without an adapter and a second memory card type via an adapter.” Jones at [0019]. This is the Figure 3B embodiment cited by the Office Action. In this embodiment, the reader can accept a compactflash card 16, or another type of card that is in an adapter that provides the 50-pin compactflash connector. For example, there is an adapter 340 for memory stick duo and another adapter 300 for miniSD/RS-MMC cards, and another adapter 300 for Triflash cards.

Jones does not describe a single slot “adapted to accommodate the plurality of types of cards.” Jones’s single slot accepts only a compact flash card 16 or an adapter with a compact flash connector. Different types of cards can not be inserted into the slot. Similarly, each adapter itself includes a slot for a single card type. Different types of cards cannot be used in the slot of an adapter. The Jones reader is not “adapted to accommodate a plurality of types of cards” – it only accepts a single type, and requires an adapter for any other type. Accordingly, Jones does not describe “a single slot adapted to accommodate the plurality of types of cards.” Neither the slot of the reader nor the slot of the adapter is “adapted to accommodate [a] plurality of types of cards,” as required by claim 1.

Moreover, Jones does not describe that “data is exchanged to an opening part having connectors that can handle the plurality of types of cards.” In Jones, the connectors 44, 440 of the readers in Figure 3B and Figure 3D are compact flash connectors. The connectors in the opening part of the reader therefore do not handle a plurality of types of cards. Similarly, the connectors in the adapters 30, 32, 34, 300, 320, 340 only accept one card type, and do not include an opening part that has connectors that handle a plurality of types of cards. Accordingly, there is no “opening part” in Jones with “connectors that can handle the plurality of types of cards.”

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over the prior art of record. Claims 2-5, 8, and 9-12 depend from claim 1 or include similar limitations and are allowable for at least the same reasons.


Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Yu in view Jones and further in view of U.S. Application No. 2002/0046877 to Hirari et al. ("Hirari").

Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 1 and include all limitations of claim 1. As described above, claim 1 is allowable over Yu and Jones, and Hirari does not add anything to cure the deficiencies of Yu with respect to claim 1. Hirari describes a CF card casing with a slot that accepts only CF cards, and therefore does not teach or suggest "a single slot adapted to accommodate [a] plurality of types of cards" or that "data is exchanged to an opening part having connectors that can handle the plurality of types of cards." Hirari Abstract; Figure 1. Claims 6 and 7 are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: June 15, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Mark J. Thronson
Registration No.: 33,082
Jonathan L. Falkler
Registration No.: 62,115
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1825 Eye Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-5403
(202) 420-2200
Attorneys for Applicant